DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 946 HE 000 268

By-Duster, Troy

"The Aims of Higher Learning and the Control of the Universities."

California Univ., Berkeley.

Spons Agency-California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.; Haynes Foundation Fellowship.

Pub Date [66]

Note-34p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80

Descriptors-*Academic Freedom, *Educational Objectives, Faculty, Governance, *Governing Boards, *Higher Education, Policy Formation, Professional Recognition, *Teacher Welfare

Contrary to popular belief, much power is vested in university governing boards that are usually composed of individuals not professionally concerned with higher education. The Center conducted a study in 1965 of trustees at 38 member institutions of the American Association of Universities, in an effort to expand previous findings on governing board members' social characteristics, attitudes and political beliefs. Since the control of higher learning shifted from the clergy to successful businessmen in the eighteenth century, academic freedom was permitted in the area of religion. Current data reveals that while a majority of board members still approve academic freedom in religious matters, they oppose the same free pursuit of knowledge when it concerns social, economic and political issues. Today's trustees are more sympathetic to the values of the academic community than their off-campus peers. But when their attitudes are studied in relationship to the aims of higher education, data show that approximately 1 out of 3 would feel that "the university is best run along the principles of a business enterprise." They therefore tend to view faculty members merely as employees rather than competent scholars, and give the administration--along with other decision-making powers affecting educational and institutional quality--authority to select, hire, retain, and fire instructors. There is a need to reappraise the relationship between the aims of higher education and the control of universities. (WM)

ED026946.

"The Aims of Higher Learning and the Control of the Universities"

Troy Duster

University of California, Berkeley

The research reported in this paper was supported in part by a Haynes Foundation Fellowship and in part by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California, Berkeley, The author gratefully acknowledges the excellent research assistance of Timothy Lehmann.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000268

"The Aims of Higher Learning and the Control of the Universities"

Ever since the late 1720s when a group of wealthy Boston merchants wrested control of Harvard from the clergy, boards of "laymen from the community" have retained the power to direct the course of American higher education. At the outset, the great majority of the faculty were clergymen, just as the governing board had been.[1] Although the colonial colleges had as their official purpose both the training of the clergy and the education of lay leaders, there was a natural bias in the realization of aims. It was this ability to realize different goals that impelled the businessmen to seize control and accelerate the already established trend of secularizing the higher learning.[2] Their coming to power reflected the spirit of the increasingly secular times. Other colleges followed Harvard's example, and laymen from the community became the high policy-makers in almost every major college by the end of the eighteenth century.

In the United States, the governing board of the college developed in time to a position of uncontested power, extensive and final. The faculty never really gave serious battle in a struggle for control.[3] The American faculty has never moved into a position to assert itself on the larger issues of goals and survival, nor indeed even on matters of expansion, development, and nature of their institution.[4] The exceptions are remarkable exceptions, and do not represent the general pattern of control and influence in the country.

When Marshall's Supreme Court declared in 1819 that colleges could be

private concerns independent of public control, the board's power was not even subject to public review. This decision led to a reaction and the establishment of the many public universities which could be directly controlled by the government. However, these new institutions held then as now the old established and prestigious private colleges as their model and ideal. It was inevitable that they would emulate the structure of the "governing board of laymen" in control. Rather than developing a state ministry of education, the land-grant colleges and the state universities set up boards of governors selected with almost the same criteria as those at the private colleges, and invested them with a similar kind of authority. It must be noted that the decision to avoid a centralized ministry of education was not based upon the belief that the college should be free and independent of public control. Indeed the public colleges developed precisely because of the strong impetus to have public control of the college.[5]

Harvard was not the innovator of the idea of a governing board of laymen. Harvard had begun upon a model of the English colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, where ecclesiastical control had been firm for centuries. Instead, the Scottish universities of the seventeenth century had established the immediate precedent, and William and Mary College had been the first in the United States to have prominent laymen in control. It was not until Harvard shifted that others followed suit, a pattern of its own in higher education.

So long as the aims of higher learning were more sacred than secular, so long as the college could pronounce that the student ". . . consider the mayne End of his life & studyes to know God & Jesus Christ, which is Eternall life,"[6] a governing board of clergymen in control served an important logical function. They could and did act as overseers in a line organization that

held the clerical faculty and students in doctrinaire check. When the primary expressed purpose of the college is to learn to serve God in a manner governed by prescribed belief systems, then an organizational hierarchy controlled by men at the top who are believed to have especial competence on the matter-at-hand makes logical and common sense. However, when the clergy lost control of the governing boards, and when the faculty gained more and more of its "academic freedom" to pursue learning independent of the proscriptions of dogma, the authority of the governing board took on an entirely different meaning.

Whereas the clerically controlled governing board could claim its particular competence to deal with the religious aims and purposes of the college as they were then conceived, laymen by definition have no such special competence to deal with the unincumbered pursuit of knowledge. This had been pointed out often enough by nineteenth century critics, but the most lucid analysis came from Thorstein Veblen at the beginning of this century.[7] Veblen noted that while business acumen might have had a role in the business side of the university, in fact the administrative office on the campus actually handles all such matters.[8]

Because the faculty is the group involved in campus affairs with the greatest potential to contest for power and control (students are disadvantaged by economic dependence and other vulnerabilities that go along with pre-legal age), its withdrawal from the power scene has left the governing board as the rarely challenged authority in higher education. Stripped as he was in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of any formal control over the college, the twentieth century faculty man has done little more than grumble about his inability to assume a more authoritative position on matters relating to the

destiny of his institution. He has registered his complaints through some intermediary to the authority he has come to accept, the governing board. With neither tradition nor the law behind him, he has lapsed into either indifference or escapism into professionalism about the control issue, rejecting out-of-hand the possibility of a united confrontation with "the board."

This is in sharp contrast to the faculties of other nations, which usually have a powerful voice in higher education. To give just one example of the contrast, every one of the (then) seven Academic Senates of the seven campuses of the University of California voted against conversion to the quarter system in the early 1960s. Whether they were "right" or "wrong" is not the issue here. The point is that the administration instituted the quarter system without so much as a major skirmish with the faculty. In contrast, Sweden, with a National Ministry of Education and formal "government control" over the system, must always take into account the possibility of strong reaction and rebuttal from its faculties.

In the summer of 1966, the faculties in Sweden at various levels of instruction including the universities were "informed" that they would have increased pay with changed working conditions. The faculties' union organization objected to the conditions, asked for more money, and executed a point-strike in four critical disciplines in the fall.[9] Aiming at only four fields, the union could afford to continue the strike for a long period because they had a large six-million dollar fund with which to pay the strikers' salaries. The government was forced to retaliate with a general lockout of all 20,000 instructors in the union, or more than 80 percent of the teaching faculties above the seventh grade. The resulting confrontation matched power with power, where the union finally called for a general strike of aligned workers. Each side made concessions, but the point is that such a struggle would be unexecutable if not

unthinkable in the United States, where the assumption of power is completely uneven.

In the United States, there is a tendency to minimize the strategic importance of university governing boards on the grounds that they are often little more than rubber-stamp functionaries far removed from campus life. While it is true that most of the immediate decision-making on the campus is in the hands of the administrative lieutenants of the board (president, dean, registrars, and their staffs), the "aims" of those who sit on the governing board affect the whole structure of the educational enterprise. These aims are subtle and abstract only when there is no conflict of will between the board and the campus. They become clear and empirically precise on those rare instances when elements on the campus assert themselves <u>against</u> the board. Because these instances are so infrequent, it is easy to make the mistake of assuming that the board is not of any great consequence. In fact, the power of the governing board is reflected in its ability to influence the whole intellectual climate of a university. One illustrative aspect of this can be seen in the power to control the expression of ideas on the campus through the restriction of speakers.[10]

The remarkable case of the Ohio State University between the years of 1950-1965 demonstrates the influence of the board of trustees on the climate of a university. During this period, the Ohio board denied the faculty and students the power to decide who they might listen to on the campus. Instead, they gave to the administration complete veto authority, which was exercised in a series of important decisions.[11] Despite the fact that the American Association of University Professors had placed Ohio State on its Censured List in the late 1950s for its treatment of faculty appointments, the Board

approved the following rule concerning speakers:

> When seeking to bring a guest speaker onto the campus, the student group must first obtain the approval of its faculty or staff adviser. Then, before it invites the speaker or announces the meeting, it must request permission for a University auditorium from the Executive Dean, Special Services. The group must state the nature of the proposed meeting and indicate the name of the guest speaker. All of this must be done no later than two weeks prior to the proposed meeting date--a time requirement that can be waived only by the President of the University. Once the name of a speaker has been submitted, the Administration's power of review starts.[12]

The affrontery to free and open expression reached such a point in the early 1960s that the liberal arts faculty finally did unite to raise serious objection. However, when the liberalization of the rule occurred in 1961, it was as much attributable to the massive student protest and demonstrations as to faculty dissatisfaction. (Trustee John Bricker had previously told the faculty if they didn't like it, "they could leave," and a score or so did.)

When an incident did produce a showdown between the faculty and the administration concerning the power to process speakers, the central on-campus liberal arts faculty stood up against the President. However, the meeting was attended by hundreds of part-time faculty in fields that ranged from dentistry to agricultural extension. Outnumbering the full-time on-campus faculty, they supported the idea that the administration should have such power, and the view prevailed until the Ohio State students took the battle to the streets in the manner and in the aftermath of the Berkeley Student Revolt. Even at that, the governing board stood fast for half a year. Only a quixotic change in the board's composition on a given day produced the present highly qualified liberalization.[13] Whatever official changes might occur for the next decade at Ohio State, the climate of the campus is for the most part set by the great difficulties the university will have in

recruiting either young or established scholars.[24] The Ohio State case is notable primarily because there was open conflict between faculty and administration.

Despite some differences between public and private universities in their administration, most have a similar structure of control through the governing board. As Kerr has noted, the federal research grant is producing even greater similarities and perhaps a subtle centralization of control for the large, well-known institutions, public and private.[25] The legislature still appropriates or denies money to the public university, while alumni, tuition, endowments, and donors supply the support to the private university. There are some significant developments which result from this and other differences, but the control in both resides in private lay citizens who are neither professional educators nor professional administrators. Though it has come to be taken for granted, the power invested in the board is extensive. It can hire and fire presidents, and with that his administrators; it can hire and fire faculty ultimately, or more directly if they choose, for actions which in the judgment of the board are "unbecoming."

Academic Freedom and Social Control

One plausible reason why academic men have not been more concerned with the study of academic freedom is that they themselves are so engulfed by the personal-political issues as to find it difficult to assume an analytic perspective. Or, perhaps they have been aware of the strategically researchable nature of the topic, but have some aversion to treating themselves and their colleagues as data. For whatever reason, the consequences are unfortunate because sociologists, for example, are somewhat knowledgeable about mechanisms of social control, and on this subject they are aided even more by the inadvertent participant observation which is built in to their situation.

From a sociological viewpoint, academic freedom can be conceived as a threat to an important form of social control in the society. Before turning to the definitional problem, academic freedom in practice allows the expression of thought from a highly respected segment of the community (university professors) that may be alien to commonly held beliefs about the nature of social order. When the clergy held the reins, the procedure for the control of alien thought at the universities was forceful, clear, and unashamedly explicit. When control passed to other interests, the academic community was constrained by whatever was the particular belief-system of the local political-economic scene. In the middle nineteenth century, the issue in the South was slavery:

> As late as 1850, apparently, it was still possible to speak freely on this issue within Southern academic walls. But toward the end of the antebellum period college presidents and professors put their tenure in jeopardy by taking such liberties.[5]

The latter part of the 19th century saw the spread of Darwinian evolutionary theory. In certain communities where the evangelical movement was strong, there were numerous heresy trials for academicians teaching the "wrong" doctrines. Also, the turn of the century was accompanied by doubts about national allegiance, especially with the approach of the first world war. This question and others concerning commitments to political and economic ideologies of free enterprise determined the intellectual climate and the license of the university instructor at that time. In each instance, expression of ideas alien to the current beliefs of the surrounding community was to risk dismissal.

Civil liberties must be here distinguished from academic freedom. The constitutional evolution of civil rights and liberties had as its purpose the assurance that the individual citizen might have free expression without

political-criminal reprisal from the state. This notion of the civil liberty of the individual did not extend to the protection of the individual's economic security, or of the right to continued employment. That is, whereas a man could not be tried or convicted for expressing his political, social, or economic views, he could certainly be fired from his job by an outraged employer who held dissimilar views.

In the late nineteenth century, scholarly research in Germany was considered of sufficient importance to the society that the academician was given economic immunity to freely express opinions that were a consequence of his research. A professor could not be relieved of his job because of his expressed ideas. However, the Germans also stipulated that this immunity was not to apply to cases where the scholar moved into contemporary political affairs. The German scholars were in compliance with this one restriction. The securement of the larger freedom connected with immunity was a very significant historical precedent. It was equally important as a statement of the conception of the social role of the scholar.

Economic immunity is thus the first essential of the idea of academic freedom. (The civil liberties and civil rights of the professor are possessed by him in any case simply by virtue of his being a citizen.) The ambiguities, confusion, and uncertainties revolve around the question of what is to be allowed under this cloak of economic immunity.

American academics rapidly incorporated from Germany the idea of economic immunity, though in most cases their views were shared by neither the university administration nor the general public. For it was that the American scholar not only took over the German notion of academic freedom, but that he also wished to include freedom of political expression. In the early 1900s

many American academic minds turned to pragmatism. If one could be satisfied only with truths seen in consequence, one could not accept restriction upon participation in events that shaped the condition of the world.

During the first world war, academic men faced internal and external pressures to define academic freedom more precisely. Harvard's president, A. Lawrence Lowell, submitted a definition widely accepted as a statement of principle but difficult to manage in practice. Lowell said that the university scholar was under the protective cloak of academic freedom so long as he spoke from within his field of specialization, "inside the competence of his chair." The working application was often impossible. In "clear" cases there was no difficulty, such as the physicist's pronouncements on sexual morality. But what of the borderline cases? What of an economist giving an economic explanation for the development of a certain kind of morality in an affluent consumer society? Who then was to decide his competence? Would it be the lay population or the lay officials of the university? His colleagues? Moreover, how far could one extrapolate from his data and still remain within the competency of his chair?

Without becoming embroiled in tedious terminological problems, it is possible to come to an empirical understanding of the concept of academic freedom for the instructor. (There is an equally important issue of the academic freedom of the student, but that will not be addressed in this paper.) That is simply to answer the question <u>to what extent</u> does the cloak of economic immunity surround him when he expresses views contrary to those generally believed in the community. The problem of the academic speciality need not be raised. To the degree that such immunity is granted, there is that degree of academic freedom.[17]

More than a half century ago, Harvard's president C. W. Eliot observed that the control over the hiring-and-firing of faculty made academic freedom the discretion of the board of trustees:

> In the institutions of higher education, the board of trustees is the body on whose discretion, good feeling, and experience the securing of academic freedom depends. There are boards which leave nothing to be desired in these respects; but there are also numerous boards that have everything to learn with regard to academic freedom. These barbarous boards exercise an arbitrary power of dismissal. They exclude from the teachings of the university unpopular or dangerous subjects.[18]

Background to the Study

In 1947, Hubert Beck published a study of the governing board members of colleges and universities in the American Association of Universities.[19] At the time of his work, the A.A.U. contained 30 member institutions from the United States.[20] The effort was by no means an attempt to study a cross-section of higher education boards. It admittedly aimed at the largest, richest, and most respected institutions in the country, for reasons that were justified by the aims and scope of the problem.

Beck drew a social profile of the American "trustee" of the major university.[21] His primary technique was to obtain data on their social characteristics, often from public records. For more than seven hundred persons on the thirty boards, he made a detailed quantification and study of their occupations, ages, income, sex, education, religious preference, etc. For these reasons alone, it would be an important document on the kinds of persons who come to powerful positions in higher education. Beck had other purposes as well. He wanted to make inferences from his data about the kinds of stands his subjects might make on substantive policy matters.

Accordingly, he made the "leap" from the social characteristics of the

board member to the social attitude and policy of the board member. There are some strong theoretical foundations for his "leap," though it left his work vulnerable to an attack that his inferences were not warranted by his data. Perhaps the major issue in the sociology of knowledge is the explanation of the relationship between biographical features of the thinker and the nature of his thought. One expression of this relationship is the Marxian position that the social-economic position of the individual determines his perspective of the world and shapes his ideology. Karl Mannheim, in this tradition, wrote:

> The ideological element in human thought. . . is always bound up with the existing life-situation of the thinker. . .
>
> It could be shown in all cases that not only do fundamental orientations, evaluations, and the content of ideas differ but that the manner of stating a problem, the sort of approach made, and even the categories in which experiences are subsumed, collected, and ordered vary according to the social position of the observer.[22]

This position, along with that set forth by Marx, asserts the nature of the relationship in its most polemic form.[23] More moderately stated, and more generally used social science theory, with empirical support, holds that the social-economic position of the individual is highly related to his social thought and social actions. For example, we know empirically that there is marked tendency for those with the highest status in a society to support the most traditional and conservative institutions. The higher one's social status, the more likely he is to believe that the world is a just world where men get what they deserve and deserve what they get. If that is true, argued Beck, then the social position of the trustees will be informative about their behavior on matters of policy and aims.

Beck's study was done on persons who were trustees during the academic

year 1934-35, so it should be kept in mind that this was the time of the Great Depression. The median annual income of the trustee was $61,000 and the median age was 59. For those for whom religious affiliation could be obtained, 85 percent were Protestant. The figure would be higher were it not that the Catholic University alone contributed over half the total Catholic trustees. (In 1935, Episcopalians and Presbyterians together constituted eight percent of the population of the country, but the two denominations made up almost half of the trustees.)[24] There was an attempt to add to this biographical data with a questionnaire which tried to tap the political persuasion of the trustee. The most striking of these findings even for a depression period was that 40 percent of the responding trustees asserted that persons on public relief should be barred from voting.[25]

Purposes of the Study

Beck's research had described the social characteristics of the governing board members, and had touched upon their political beliefs. A goal of the present research was to expand and elaborate in areas where the previous work did not venture. For example, the data collected are intended to help fill in the "leap" from the social characteristics of the trustees to their decisions on university policy matters. There has been no attempt to reobtain the kind of detailed biographical information on all the trustees.[26] Instead, there has been a concentration upon the kinds of ideas the board members actually express on substantive issues. The data include responses to a number of different kinds of questions in different areas of university life, addressing different goals of higher education. Questions ranged from the trustee's conception of "academic freedom" to "what they would have done" in the Berkeley Student Revolt in the fall of 1964.

The limitations of this approach are readily apparent, but they are not prohibitive of research results that are of theoretical use and of practical significance. In the best of possible research situations, one would have access to the actual stands taken by the members at their board meetings. This could then be related to the social variables that Beck used to check against the relationship which he predicted. That kind of research is not possible for several reasons. Inaccessibility, time, and money are only the strategic barriers. Even if they were solved, in this case the observation itself would alter the behavior of the subject. That is also partly true of the questionnaire technique. The respondents probably bend their answers a bit away from the direction in which they would actually behave in the situation. Nevertheless, we can use these responses as the best available general indicators of behavior. They provide at the very least a normative statement about the way the respondent believes he ought to behave. (Or, perhaps the way he thinks it is expected that he ought to behave.) These conceptions of normative directives are themselves guidelines to action that is taken.

Data Collection

In August, 1964, an introductory letter was written to thirty-eight university presidents of member institutions of the American Association of Universities. (As in the previous study, the Canadian universities were excluded.) The letter indicated that the principal investigator of the research project wanted to update and expand some research on governing boards. It invited the presidents to participate, and asked for their cooperation in the attempt to secure a high return rate from their respective boards. Of the more than three-quarters of the presidents who responded in some form,

the overwhelming majority were supportive. Only one categorically refused cooperation.[27]

The mailed questionnaire as a means of studying a population is burdened by many difficulties. The deficiences of the method are well discussed in the literature of the methodology of the social sciences. If the technical and mechanical problems were not enough, there are also the problems of the best phrasing of the question, and the area touched by the question itself. Every adult has probably been exposed to exasperating and senseless questionnaires, where one is "forced" to choose among five unacceptable alternatives. One would often prefer to write an essay rather than "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," etc. The construction of the questionnaire used in this study tried to adjust to this problem by acknowledging the frustration the subject most feel by such "forced choices" and by encouraging personal responses. For every question, this could have been done if the subject wished, and there were additional spaces interspersed throughout for more extensive answers and commentary.

In March, 1965, the first questionnaire was mailed directly to over 700 governing board members.[28] The first returns brought slightly over 200 responses, and a second attempt was made in December, 1965 to contact board members again. An additional 100 were received, bringing the total to 306. The rate of return was uncannily similar to Beck's return rate in the study of the 1930s. Of 734 requests, Beck got 301. In the present study, there were 726 requests and 306 replies.

By ordinary standards, the rate of return is low, but there are compelling reasons why ordinary standards should not be applied to this population. First, the subjects are extraordinary in their inaccessibility resulting from the extensive travelling attendant to their <u>other</u> positions. Second,

the fact that these subjects are much older than subjects in most questionnaire studies means that they are much more likely to be incapable of responding due to illness, hospitalization, and in some cases death. The median age of those responding was 60, whereas the median age of the non-respondents was almost 70. Not only are the younger trustees simply more physically capable and willing to respond, they are also likely to be more willing to respond because of greater sympathy for social research.

The relatively low return rate poses less of a problem than it ordinarily might for another reason. A sample of the non-respondents was analyzed on the same kind of census questions as the responding population. Comparisons revealed a pattern of the direction of the difference in the populations that allow one to extrapolate to more general characteristics of the non-respondents. I have already indicated that the latter were generally older. The non-respondents were also more skewed in the direction of business affiliations and related occupations. Thus, rather than treating the conclusiveness of the findings jeopardized by the 40 percent return rate, it is as reasonable to treat them as highly suggestive of the nature and direction of responses of the study's universe.

Findings

The median age of the trustee in this study is 60, though the mode is a few years higher. The median and modal income for the trustee is between $50,000 and $75,000 per year. In this sample of 306, there was one labor official, but not a single working-class occupation was represented. There was one Negro, eight clergymen, and 10 professors. The remainder were white, in secular and successful business enterprise, and as expected, not professionally connected with higher learning.

At the outset, it was noted that the control of higher education began to pass from the hands of the clergy to successful businessmen in the eighteenth century. This development was directly related to the increasing secularization of life in the West in general and America in particular, and paralleled the development of what Weber called "the spirit of capitalism" in the Protestant world. Clerical control had not permitted the academic freedom to pursue religious ideas "Where-ever they might lead." This was early illustrated in the famous case of Harvard's first president, who was ousted for a minor deviation from religious orthodoxy. (At the time, the university president also taught courses.) When control passed to the merchants, it was natural that in time they would permit academic freedom to pursue religious questions. For example, though it took many decades, the theory of evolution can now be taught in every major American university. The present study documents the fact that we have almost come full circle in this matter, as over 80 percent of the trustees favored complete academic freedom (economic immunity) of the instructor on religious questions.

However, on political, economic, and social questions, the "board of laymen," secular in their interests, is not nearly so willing to permit deviation and free pursuit. It is consistent that secular men permit adventure into ideas about other-wordly matters, while they are much more concerned about controlling the pursuit of ideas relating to this world. In contrast to the extremely low percentage rejection on the religious issue, more than one-third of the trustees expressed their disapproval of full academic freedom in political questions. (Table 1) The finding is all the more dramatic when we notice the difference between trustees at public and private universities. Almost half of the public trustees are against political academic freedom as defined,

compared to the one-third of the governing board members in private institutions who were negative. (Table 2) Why this is true should be the source of some interesting speculation at a later point.

Table 1 Response of all trustees to the "academic freedom" of the instructor in political areas: "Without fear of being fired, the right to hold and express publicly any political position (including neo-fascist, socialist, or communist) so long as the classroom is not used as a forum for the expression of those views."

	Percent	N
Agree,* should have free expression without penalty	57.5	176
Disagree	35.6	109
No opinion or no answer	6.9	21
Totals	100.0	306

*("Strongly agree" and "agree" were collapsed, as were the responses of disagreement. This procedure is followed in all the tables.)

Table 2 Response to the same question as in Table 1, separating private from public trustees.*

	Private Trustees		Public Trustees	
	Percent	N	Percent	N
Agree	61.1	128	52.5	41
Disagree	31.1	65	43.5	34
No opinion or no answer	7.7	16	3.8	3
Totals	100.0	209	100.0	78

*Total N does not reach 306 because of 19 cases of "no answers" on the public vs. private university question and/or the inability to identify with complete precision on this matter.

The findings reveal further remarkable substantive variations among the trustees. One line of responses provided a test of the Veblen hypothesis of the relationship between the "business ethic" of the trustee and his conception of the university itself in terms of a going concern of business. While many of the trustees express the opinion that the university should be run along the principles of a business with criteria of output and organization, more than half reject this. (Table 3) In terms of hypotheses advanced by Veblen and Beck, a direct test occurs when we separate the "business ethic" trustee from those other governing board members who reject the business ethic in higher learning. The findings reported in Table 4 are worthy of special note because social research does not often obtain such extremely clear differences between attitudinal dimensions. Forty percent of those with a business ethic believe there to be too much academic freedom in the United States, while only five percent of those without the business ideology for the university responded in this manner. In short, Veblen's theoretical argument about business-minded men in control of the university turns out to have strong empirical support.[29]

Table 3 Response of all trustees in sample to the question: "To what extent do you agree with the position that a university is best conducted along the same principles of organization and output as a business enterprise?"

	Percent	N	
Agree, conduct university as business ..	32.7	100	cont., see Table 4
Disagree	52.9	162	
No answer or no opinion	3.6	11	
Qualified or uncertain	5.2	16	
Totals	100.0	306	

Table 4 Among the 262 trustees shown in Table 3 who took a position as to whether or not the university should be run along the same principles as a business enterprise, the response to the question: "In the major universities of the United States, do you believe that there is too much or too little academic freedom?"

	Trustees Advocating University as a Business Concern		Trustees Rejecting View of University as a Business Concern	
	Percent	N	Percent	N
Too much academic freedom	40.0	40	4.9	8
Right amount	50.0	50	62.7	100
Too little	8.0	8	14.2	23
Varies	-	-	2.5	4
No answer or no opinion	2.0	2	15.7	27
Totals	100.0	100	100.0	162

Restriction in the forums of expression is an essential ingredient in the control of ideas. The one place where the keenest critics of a society are most apt to get an open hearing from the citizenry is in the university, the social institution most dedicated to critical analysis. Students and faculty interested in pursuing certain problems and issues analytically are themselves usually not engaged directly in certain critical social processes, and any gain in their analytic facility by being allowed to observe and hear from those who are actively engaged. Thus, students (and sometimes faculty) often invite persons from the community or society to speak upon an issue, that they may better understand for themselves the position.

The freedom of speakers from "outside" to appear on the campus of the institution of the academic community is thus an important element of academic life itself. The trustees have placed the power of selection not in the hands of those who have the greatest analytic competence in the pursuit of

the problem, but in the hands of those whose job it is to administer the non-academic side of the community, the administration. An overwhelming majority of the trustees support the position that the administration should determine who shall not be allowed to speak on the campus. Only nine percent believe that the faculty should have such control. (Table 5)

Table 5 Response in answer to the question of which of the following segments of the campus should have final authority to veto speakers who come to the campus.

	Percent	N
Administration	67.3	206
Faculty	8.8	27
Both	13.2	40
Other	.3	1
Neither	7.8	24
No answer or no opinion	2.6	8
Totals	100.0	306

The development of social fraternities and athletics on the American campus served to channel the students' passions away from vital social issues, acting as a damper on student political activity and student quest for more control over their own destinies. Since the Civil War, the American college student, almost alone in the world in this respect, has been submerged in trivial and inconsequential activity as far as the society-at-large has been concerned. For 100 years, the American students have passively watched the anti-trust and monopoly battles, the labor-management fights, and the ethnic and racial minorities struggle, raising their voices in unison only at the Saturday afternoon football game.[30] Meanwhile, the university students of Germany, China, Japan, Scandinavia, Russia, and the Netherlands, to name but

a few, were far more involved in the economic, political, and social issues of their countries.[31] Whether they were "right" or "wrong", university students have provided much of the intellectual force and some of the central and critical manpower for the major revolutions of the last century: China (1912, 1927 and 1946), India (1948), Russia (1905 and 1917), and African nations (1948-60). These revolutions have directly affected the lives of three-quarters of the world's population, and their consequences are so far-reaching that they ultimately return to touch directly upon the lives of all.

What must strike the observer of the American university scene with great impact is how few students have been actively engaged by the two moral issues of our time, Civil Rights and Vietnam. It is in this context that we view the governing board members' respective attitudes to social fraternities and student political activity. It is not surprising that a large plurality indicated that they would actively encourage the establishment and maintenance of fraternities. Two out of every three trustees either supported fraternities or were neutral. (Table 6) Approximately one-fourth said that they would actively discourage the institution. It is surprising that the trustees from the public universities are more conservative on this issue than are governing board members from private institutions. Indeed, one of the more interesting patterns in this study was a general tendency for public institution trustees to express generally more conservative views. More than two-thirds of the public institution trustees would encourage fraternities, while only one of every three from the private colleges were supportive. (Table 7)

Because private institutions are more dependent upon donations and support from alumni, and because fraternities tend to draw the alumni, we would have expected trustees from the private universities to be more receptive to fraternities.

Table 6 Response of trustees to question of whether they would "encourage or discourage social fraternities" in institutions of higher learning in America.

	Percent	N
Encourage social fraternities	43.5	133
Discourage	28.4	87
Indifferent or neutral	26.1	80
No answer or no opinion	2.0	6
Totals	100.0	306

Table 7 Trustees of private universities versus trustees of public universities differing response to the question about support of social fraternities in higher education.

	Private Trustees		Public Trustees	
	Percent	N	Percent	N
Encourage social fraternities	34.2	71	67.9	53
Discourage	35.9	75	12.8	10
Indifferent or neutral	27.9	58	19.3	15
No answer or no opinion	1.9	4	-	-
Totals	100.0	209	100.0	78

We have suggested that direct political activity of the students is directly related to the fraternity issue.[32] The Berkeley student revolt of the fall, 1964 was the direct consequence of the administration's restriction of student political activity. All who have written on the subject agree to that basic point, even if they disagree about the meaning, effects, tactics, and portents of the revolt.[33] While some have argued that it was a student quest for more power and control, others have seen it as an anarchistic statement, and others saw it as a legitimate attempt to redress just grievances. Fortunately for this study, the Berkeley revolt was still simmering at the time the trustees were first asked to respond. This provided the opportunity to include several questions on the Berkeley situation. More specifically, questions were asked concerning how the trustees think they would have reacted had they been Regents at the University of California at the time, what they believed to be the source of the trouble, and how much they knew about it.

Less than twenty percent of the trustees responded in a manner that could be conceived to be supportive of the student political activity. Only three percent favored liberalization of the regulations governing student political activity, and censure of the administration.

Objections to the tactics employed in the revolt (Sproul Hall sit-in) can be confused with objections to student political activity. A trustee might surely favor political expression without favoring revolt, rule-breaking, etc. The trustees' response to the Berkeley situation was clearer than that. They had the opportunity to respond in a variety of ways which allowed analysis of the separate strains to the objections. Were it simply a matter of censuring student tactics, that would have been identifiable.

When absolute power and authority are invested in a body, the way in which that body <u>chooses</u> to delegate authority is of the greatest importance

to the structure of the institution. That choice is an expression of the investments and attitudes of the body with power, so there is a direct link between the expression and the exercise of power. The power of the university governing board is uncontested. With the campus divided into three parts (faculty, students, and administration) the board decides which of these three will assume the authority to make the immediate decisions on the campus. The American conception of the student as immature, irresponsible, and in need of moral guidance and control precludes the possibility that the students are even considered candidates for the exercise of power.

Once again, a European comparison is instructive of alternatives that are usually not entertained in the United States. In the former case, student representatives must often be consulted for any major change in educational policy. The advice of the students need not be heeded by law, but the fact that there is specific machinery for the formal acceptance of student opinion genuinely reflects the stature of student opinion in policy matters, and the implicit power assigned to them by the national ministries.

The American board member reflects the attitude of the society of which he is a member by not seriously entertaining the student as a voice in university policy matters. Thus, the choice of who it is to whom power is to be delegated is between the faculty and the administration. One of the purposes of this study was to ascertain not only where the choice lies, but the relative strength of sentiment and its distribution on some important matters in university life.

The power to hire and fire the faculty is a critical issue of control, and the trustees overwhelmingly place this power in the hands of the administration. The nature and quality of the faculty is perhaps the most important determinant of the nature and quality of the institution. An

eminent faculty insures the university of great prestige, which in turn attracts good students. In an age of academic specialization, the professor in a given discipline is the person best qualified to judge the competence and eminence of a prospective colleague. Nonetheless, the governing board has given over to the administration the final authority in the selection and retention of the faculty. In practice, the faculty still has the dominant voice, and it is usually only on the matter of a strong veto that the administration directly exercises its authority in the hiring question. However, the fact that the faculty can not be sure that its selection will always meet with the approval of the dean supplies it with a large measure of caution and responsiveness to the wishes of the administration. If, for example, the dean is very much concerned about the research capabilities of a prospective instructor, he will certainly communicate this to the relevant faculty where there is a vacancy. Despite the fact that the department members may feel that teaching ability, intellectual breadth, and "humanistic" orientation are equally important, they may opt for the "professional" in compliance with the wishes of the administration.

It is now taken rather much for granted that the university professor is an employee, much in the same way that an executive in a corporation is an employee to be hired and fired by the employer. The general acceptance of this notion is a victory for the Boston businessmen who first took over the control of Harvard. When the secular and business interests began to dominate the academic scene, it was inevitable that the criteria of success which businessmen possessed would influence the course of higher education. The European antecedents of the American college certainly had no such conception of the professorial role as that of an "employee."[34] From time to time, a few cases of an instructor's dismissal has brought with it the claim and the

defense that he has a "right to his position" that is not subject to an employer's contractual agreement.[35]

Conclusions

Hubert Beck's study of university trustees, based primarily upon an analysis of their social characteristics and selected political attitudes concluded that they were a select and conservative group whose policy positions would not be in keeping with the "aims" of higher education as now conceived. Whether for better or worse, Clark Kerr is at least accurate in his description of the contemporary American university as a multi-dimensional creation at odds with itself.[36] Nonetheless, there are identifiable aims of the American university, and what disagreement there is about them concerns which aim is chosen for treatment as the one most primary. Whether we choose Newman's "idea" of a university, Flexner's "scholar," or the ancient-to-contemporary ambiguity of "service" to society, the realization of any of those aims is intertwined with the academic freedom of the professor and the student to pursue areas of inquiry without arbitrary constraints. So long as religious orthodoxy was the primary function of the university, it was understandable and even defensible with those aims that religious deviation would not be permitted. When control of higher education passed to more secular hands, it was equally understandable but hardly defensible that secular deviation would be penalized.

This study is in one sense a compliment to Beck's work in its attempt to provide some answers in the area where he was most vulnerable to criticism. Two qualifying remarks are necessary before turning to that problem.

First, there is some evidence that the trustees are more sympathetic to the values of the academic community than others of their social, economic, and

political positions. Several of the respondents volunteered that they are very much at odds with most of their friends and associates on matters of academic freedom, for example. Contact with the university undoubtedly plays a role in influencing their position. Second, analysis of a sample of non-respondents suggests that those responding are also more sympathetic to a freer pursuit of knowledge than the non-respondents.[37]

Despite these two qualifications, it is fair to conclude that Veblen and Beck were in general correct in their surmise and prediction about the direction and substance of the academic policy views held by university governing board members. The issue of greater significance is the relationship of this element to the question of the aims of higher learning. There is no argument about the idea that the power to control the university should be in the hands of those most competent and most committed to the realization of the aims of the university. (If the aim of a business is profit, then it is organizational folly to permit control by those whose primary commitment is to the search for truth.) In higher education, arguments <u>can</u> develop around the nature and primacy of aims, the delegation of power, and the criteria of competence and commitment in the exercise of power. Yet, the society and the university community have not engaged in an open critical discussion about these arguable matters. Instead, some forty years after Veblen's seminal essay the data can reveal that at least one of every three trustees will explicitly state that "the university is best run along the principles of a business enterprise."

The data tell us more; that the trustees who feel this way about the business character of the university are those most hostile to secular unorthodoxy. The point is not simply that Veblen and Beck were right, but that in being right they put their finger on an important vacuous inconsistency

in the control of higher learning. That inconsistency has been ignored, essays on the subject have been summarily dismissed, and earlier data were discounted as inconclusive. Some function can be served if stimulation can be provided for a reappraisal of the relationship between control and aims in the universities.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. S. Brubacher and W. Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, New York: Harper & Row, 1958, p. 9.

2. Ibid., pp. 6-21.

3. American institutions of higher learning are so diverse that it is impossible to speak of an "American system." However, that fact can act to blind one to those features which are common themes and general patterns even though not universally the case. An attempt to get an overview of the issues of power and control location reveals general patterns that must be investigated if one is to comprehend the nature of diversification itself.

4. See the following works for the historical development of the faculty's role in educational policy:
Perry Miller, The New England Mind, New York: MacMillan, 1939;
John E. Kirkpatrick, Academic Organization and Control, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 1931;
S. E. Morison, Harvard College in the 17th Century, Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1936;
Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit.

5. Thomas Jefferson, perhaps the prime mover at the University of Virginia, was a firm advocate of such public control. He and those who took his position never made the same argument for the separation of Church and State as for School and State. The separation of the former was for them as much a protector of basic freedoms as was the integration of the latter. cf. Leon B. Richardson, History of Dartmouth College, Hanover: Dartmouth Publ., Vol. I, Ch. 6.

6. Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit., p. 8.

7. Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America, New York: Sagamore Press, Inc., 1957, pp. 43-61. Veblen had concluded that America's faith success and great wealth from business are reflections of generic wisdom explained the uncritical acceptance of businessmen as the controllers of education.

8. Ibid.

9. Dagens Nyheter, Stockholm, Sweden, September 14, 1966, p. 1.

10. This restriction is often justified on the grounds that the campus is a place of learning and not "political territory." However, this position is remarkably inconsistent since government officials are often invited to speak on the campus in behalf of government-sponsored explicitly political interests and ideas. From minor local officials to the President, the campus rostrum is frequently used as pulpit for the espousal of very partisan politics.

11. See the following sources on the Ohio State case: Ohio State University Monthly for the three months of May, June, and July, 1965. Also, Eric Solomon, "Free Speech at Ohio State," in Atlantic Monthly, November, 1965, pp. 119-123, and "Atlantic Monthly Looks at Speaker's Rule," in OSU Monthly, December, 1965, pp. 6-7.

12. OSU Monthly, op. cit., July, 1965, pp. 6-7.

13. See the various versions of this listed under footnote 11.

14. OSU Monthly, op. cit., December, 1965, J. H. Wilson, "A Teacher Comments," pp. 7-8.

15. Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University, New York: Harper & Row, 1966, pp. 46-54.

16. Brubacher and Rudy, op. cit., pp. 297-298. This whole discussion of academic freedom is heavily indebted to this work.

17. On assessing or comparing the degree of academic freedom in two societies or two universities, the range of expression allowed in the communities-at-large is also an issue of considerable relevance. However, the application of the kind of measuring device suggested here would be possible even if this were not taken into account. I have in mind the situation where the range in Community A is wide, and very narrow in Community B. If academic men in Community B walked a very narrow path in their work, there would be no sanctions. On the contrary, the free expression in Community A might produce the desire to "go still further," at which point sanctions would be forthcoming. It would seem to be arguable that the device suggested would only assess sanctions and thus conclude that there was more academic freedom in Community B. On closer inspection, this problem would be solved by observing whether or not sanctions would be imposed if a certain line of inquiry were attempted.

18. C. W. Eliot, "Academic Freedom," Phi Beta Kappa Address at Cornell University, May 29, 1907.

19. Robert P. Beck, Men Who Control Our Universities, Morningside Hts., New York: King's Crown Press, 1947.

20. Beck excluded the two Canadian universities from his study because he did not want to confuse his findings with responses under the British or French influence in Canada.

21. A member of a university governing board is variously called in different states and colleges a "regent," "trustee," "governor," "overseer," and other titles. In order to avoid the more cumbersome correct title of "governing board member" at every point in this paper, the title "trustee" has been arbitrarily chosen for interchangeable use with "governing board member."

22. Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1936.

23. L. Feuer, Ed., Marx and Engels, Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Anchor, Co., 1959.

24. Hubert Beck, op. cit.

25. Ibid.

26. This study also includes biographical information on the governing board member unable in comparison with the Beck study.

27. This one refusal was from a president quite partial to "hard" science who expressed hostile remarks about "social "science"" in general.

28. For institutions with governing boards with up to 30 members, the whole universe was taken. However, to include the whole board of North Carolina, for example, with over 120 members would skew and overweight the study towards a single university. Thus, in institutions with more than 30 trustees, a random sampling device was used to correct for this weighting, restricting the sample between 25-28.

29. Veblen, op. cit., Chapters 2 and 3.

30. Wayne Haugrave, College Fraternities, New York: Interfraternity Conference, 1927; Woodrow Wilson, "What is College for," Scribner's Magazine, Vol., XLVI, November, 1909, pp. 572-575; Howard J. Savage, Harold W. Bentley, John T. Mckeown, Dean F. Smiley, American College Athletics, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, 1929; H. J. Savage, John T. McKeown, Harold W. Bentley, Current Developments in American College Sports, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, 1931; H. J. Savage, Games and Sports in British Schools and Universities, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, 1927.

31. Wen-han Chiang, The Chinese Student Movement, New York: King's Crown Press, 1948.
"China Viewpoints," The Storm: Student Unrest in China, Hong Kong, 1958, 44 p.
Tsi Chang Yang, The Youth Movement in China, New York: New Republic Inc., 1927.
Communist China: The Politics of Student Opposition, Transl. w. introd. by Dennis J. Doolin, Hoover Institute on War, Revolution & Peace, Stanford University, 1964.
Isaac Leon Kandel, The Making of Nazis, New York Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.
Prabodh Chandra, Student Movement in India, Lahore: All-India Students Federation, 1939.
Humayun Kabir, Student Unrest, Causes and Cure, Calcutta: Orient Book Co., 1958.
James Bruce Amerine, The Indonesian Youth Movement 1908-1958, Medford, Massachusetts, 1958.
Lawrence Henry Battistini, The Postwar Student Struggle in Japan, Tokyo: C. E. Tuttle Co., 1956.

31. (continued)
"Special Issue on Student Politics" in Comparative Educational Review, Vol. 10, No. 2, June 1966, pp. 129-367
for example:
"University Students and Politics in Underdeveloped Countries," by S. M. Lipset.
"Student Unrest on Four Continents: Montreal, Ibadan, Warsaw and Rangoon," by George Z. F. Bereday.
"The Active Few: Student Ideology and Participation in Developing Countries," by Glancio A. D. Soares.
"A Comparison of University Reform Movements in Argentina and Colcmbia," by Kenneth N. Walker.
"University Experience and Political Unrest of Students in Buenos Aires," by David Nasatir.
"The French Student Movement," by Jean-Pierre Worms.

32. After the Berkeley Student Revolt in 1964, occasioned by increased political activity of the students on the campus, freshmen entering fraternities the following year dropped off so markedly that several fraternities either disbanded or were struggling for existence. Meanwhile, at the Santa Barbara campus of the University of California where there is never any noticeable political agitation or activity, pledges to fraternities and sororities skyrocketed during that same fall of 1965.

33. S. M. Lipset, S. Wolin, S. Sheldon (eds.), The Berkeley Student Revolt Facts and Interpretations, New York: Anchor Books: Doubleday & Co., 1965.
Hal Draper, Berkeley: The New Student Revolt, New York: Grove Press Inc., 1965.
Michael V. Miller and Susan Gilmore (eds.), Revolution at Berkeley, The Crisis in American Education, New York: Dell Publishing Co.,1965.

34. See the relevant discussion on this topic in Brubacher and Rudy, op.cit., pp. 355-359.

35. Ibid.

36. Clark Kerr, op.cit., pp. 1-46.

37. See the discussion of the sample of non-respondents under the section entitled "Data Collection" in this paper.